



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/201,484		11/30/1998	J WILTSE CARPENTER	3382-51386 1596	
26119	7590	10/19/2005		EXAMINER	
		RKMAN LLP	KOENIG, ANDREW Y		
121 S.W. SA		TREET		C	
SUITE 1600				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PORTLAND	OR 97	7204	2611		

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		09/201,484	CARPENTER ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Andrew Y. Koenig	2611					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress				
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vere to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONEI	N. nely filed the mailing date of this cools (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•				
Status								
1) 🏹	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 A</u>	ugust 2005						
2a)□		action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowar		secution as to the	e morite is				
٠,۵	closed in accordance with the practice under E	•						
Dispositi	ion of Claims							
· _		Maria Parka						
	Claim(s) <u>1-4,17,18 and 25-35</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
_	☐ Claim(s) <u>1-4,17,18 and 25-34</u> is/are allowed.							
· _	Claim(s) <u>35</u> is/are rejected.	•						
· <u> </u>	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
ا_ا(ه	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.	·					
Applicati	on Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.	•					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PT	O-152.				
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).					
_	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		(3) 31 (1)					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.		,				
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No.					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior			Stage				
	application from the International Bureau			go				
* S	see the attached detailed Office action for a list of	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	đ.					
		,						
Attachment		r						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Dat						
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal Pa)-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:								

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 33-35 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. Claims 1-4, 17-18, 25-34 are allowed.

Regarding independent claims 1, 17, and 25, prior art of record fails to show or reasonably suggest: the combination of two different and non-compatible video on demand applications in combination with a proxy interposed between the server and the client, wherein the proxy is for translating control data compatible with the first video-on-demand application but not compatible with the second video on demand application into control data compatible with the second video on demand application but not compatible with the first video on demand application, wherein the control protocol/data is for the video on demand application (e.g. application layer— see remarks, pg. 13, para. 1) as recited in the claims.

Regarding independent claims 28, 31, and 32, prior art of record fails to show or reasonably suggest: the combination of two different and non-compatible video on demand applications in combination with translating control data compatible with the first video-on-demand application but not compatible with the second video on demand application into control data compatible with the second video on demand application but not compatible with the first video on demand application, wherein the control data

is for the video on demand application (e.g. application layer – see remarks, pg. 13, para. 1) as recited in the claims.

Regarding claim 33, prior art of record fails to show or reasonably suggest the combination of components of plural servers and clients, where at least one client communicates according to a video on demand application incompatible with at least one server, wherein the proxy server translates according to incompatible video on demand applications (e.g. application layer— see remarks, pg. 13, para. 1), such that the control data of the first application employed by a client and control data of a second application expected by the server are translated, as recited in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 35 recites a "communications protocol comprises DAVEC or DSMTC," which is supported in the specification pg. 3, II. 5-6. DAVEC and DSMTC are not known in the art and thus the scope of these terms are undefined thereby rendering the claim vague and indefinite. Applicant may have intended DAVIC and DSM-CC, both of which are known protocols.

Art Unit: 2611

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Y. Koenig whose telephone number is (571) 272-7296. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (7:30 - 6:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Grant can be reached on (571) 272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ayk